


1 counsel's use of the contact information in connection with the thirty putative interveners. The  
2 stipulation also called for *in camera* review of plaintiff counsel's correspondence with the  
3 putative interveners, however, the undersigned judge instead ordered plaintiff's counsel to  
4 tentatively file them under seal (Dkt. No. 118). In response, plaintiff's counsel filed these  
5 exemplars under seal and they were reviewed by the undersigned judge (Dkt. No. 121).

6 Defendants now argue that they should be entitled to review the unredacted  
7 communications between plaintiff's counsel and the prospective interveners (Dkt. No. 126).  
8 Without deciding whether there is any privilege to these documents, defendants' request is  
9 **Denied**. Defendants already agreed to *in camera* review of the documents. In addition, the  
10 undersigned judge has reviewed the documents and found there to be no untoward conduct.  
11 Accordingly, the documents filed by plaintiff's counsel will remain under seal.

12  
13  
14 Dated: December 19, 2013

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
WILLIAM ALSUP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE